DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 722 JC 730 222

AUTHOR	Schmidt, George A., Jr.
TITLE	A Nationwide Study: State-Level Coordination of Student Personnel Services in Community Junior Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE	[72]
NOTE	61p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization; *Community Colleges; Data Analysis; Data Collection; *Interagency Cooperation; *National Surveys; Post Secondary Education; Questionnaires; Staff Utilization; State Agencies; *Student Personnel Services; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	Puerto Rico; United States

ABSTRACT

During the Spring of 1972, a survey was conducted of state agencies for community/junior colleges in the 50 states and Puerto Rico. The purposes of the survey were to: (1) determine if the agency had designated staff with exclusive or primary responsibility for providing administrative services to local student affairs staffs; (2) detefmine academic and professional background of state-level student personnel services staff; (3) determine the nature of the state agency staff's organization; and (4) develop a useable directory of personnel at the various agencies to facilitate interstate communication and cooperation. A questionnaire, designed for the survey, contained questions in three major areas: Staffing, Administrative Organization, and Relationships with other Agencies. The questionnaire was distributed to the chief state officer for community colleges. Five states did not respond. Results of an analysis of the questionnaire data showed that: (1) 21% of the state agencies had one or more staff members who routinely were engaged a percentage of his time in student affairs; 10 of the 24 professional held the doctorate, 3 held advanced master's degrees, 10 had a master's degree, and 1 had a bachelor's degree; (2) 22 agencies had made provision for regular meetings of the chief student affairs officers of the colleges , and 11 states have established formalized councils; meetings are held to exchange information, make recommendations, and provide for in-service training; and (3) the student affairs staff member seems to relate most frequently to the Vocational/Technical Education Division, Pupil Personnel or Guidance Division, and State Financial Aid Agency. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082722

A NATIONWIDE STUDY:
STATE-LEVEL COORDINATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES IN COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By George A. Schmidt Jr.

JC 730 222

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

ED 082722

A NATIONWIDE STUDY:
STATE-LEVEL COORDINATION
OF
STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES
IN
COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

By

GEORGE A. SCHMIDT JR.

Department of Higher Education
The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

A publication of
The Center for State and Regional Leadership
(Florida State University/University of Florida)
with the assistance of a grant from the
W. K. Kellogg Foundation

PREFACE

The perceptions of state level leadership for community/junior colleges vary, often reflecting the different state organizations or different professional specializations. Budgets, coordination, and planning are among the most prominent activities visualized. This is understandable since legislation, appropriations and state wide manpower requirements for education and training are a natural function of state government.

Unfortunately, state agencies are seldom perceived as deeply concerned with the individual student. In reality, state officials responsible for community/junior colleges concentrate upon the student in nearly every daily endeavor.

As the legal structure for establishment and operation of community colleges becomes defined and as capital and operating budgets are provided, state directors turn to other leadership needs. Student personnel services are an integral part of the educational program of the community college. As a result they are natural candidates for attention by the state agencies.

This monograph reports upon the growing attention being placed by state agencies upon student personnel services. The study was conducted by Mr. George A. Schmidt, Jr,

a W. K. Kellogg Fellow and doctoral candidate in the Department of Higher Education at The Florida State University. Publication of his study is part of the series of reports of student investigation undertaken by the FSU/UF Center for State and Regional Leadership, supported in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Many of the problems and issues investigated by the graduate students in this leadership program are identified by state directors of community/junior colleges and their staffs.

Louis W. Bender
Professor of Higher Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		ii
List of Tables		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Role of Statewide Coordination for Community Colleges	
II.	THE STUDY	10
	Purposes Procedures Data Collection	
	DATA ANALYSIS	13
	Introduction Staffing Administrative Organization Relationships With Other Agencies	
III.	SURVEY RESULTS	41
	Introduction Summary of Findings	
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	45
Notes		50

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
I	States with one or more professional staff in the area of student affairs and the percentage of time each devoted to this area	14
II	A listing by frequency of response for areas of responsibility other than student affairs	15
III	Number of years state agency had had a staff member with student affairs responsibility and number of years incumbent in present position	17
IV	Last previous position held by the present student personnel staff specialist in state agencies for community colleges	20
V	Educational background--highest degree earned and major emphasis of highest degree--of chief student personnel specialists in state agencies for community colleges	22
VI	Formula rates for staffing for student personnel in the colleges of Minnesota, North Carolina and Virginia	26
VII	A listing of the states where provision was made for regular meetings of chief student personnel officers of the community colleges of the state, together with a listing of the frequency of such meetings	27
VIII	A listing by frequency of response of the purposes for holding regular meetings of chief student personnel administrators	28
IX	States with formally organized state-wide Councils of Student Affairs, date of formation, sources of authority and frequency of meetings	30

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

American higher education has demonstrated a remarkable ability to expand during the past six decades. Only recently, however, has the concept of state systems begun to develop. It is important to note that it is only within the past twenty-five years that higher education has become a major consumer of state resources. Prior to this time period, relatively few citizens were directly affected, since only a small proportion of students went on to college anywhere, and not many of these attended publicly supported institutions in many states.[1] The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School has asserted:

> . . . it is essential to plan comprehensively, to establish and adhere to priorities, and to coordinate better the efforts of neighboring institutions.[2]

Swelling enrollments, mounting budgets, competition for funds among public services, and the almost weekly establishment of new institutions made some kind of coordination inevitable. Thus, in nearly every state there is coordination of higher education although the mechanisms differ. In

a 1971 report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the Commission's first recommendation was:

> . . . that state governments continue to exercise major responsibility, in cooperation with local governments and private institutions, for maintaining, improving, and expanding systems of post-secondary education adequate to meet the needs of the American people.[3]

The structure for state-level planning, development, control, coordination and supervision has seen dramatic changes since the late 1950's. Between 1958 and 1968, eighteen states re-examined their approaches for state-level administration of community junior colleges, and from that re-evaluation concluded that a separate state board was best for this purpose.[4] Prior to their explosive expansion, community colleges were viewed from the state-level as part of the secondary school system. Specifically concerning the coordination or control of community colleges, twenty-seven states, as of August, 1971, have established formal mechanisms.[5]

Obviously, there is a wide variation in the degree of responsibility the states assume for community college affairs and in the extent to which they are associated in their duties with other local state boards. The significant point lies in the sudden increase in the number of states

which have, in relatively recent years, found necessary some degree of separation and special identification of the locus for supervision of the institutions at the state-level.[6]

In his nationwide, comprehensive study of state coordinating and governing agencies, Glenny found that legislators and institutional officers generally agreed that, "a statewide coordinating agency may lessen inter-institutional conflicts, may create a more favorable attitude toward higher education among legislators, and may establish legislative-supported long-range facility construction programs."[7]

The coordinating agency can offer distinct benefits to the community colleges it serves. Glenny has suggested that such an agency could effectively provide equitable financial support to insure that programs of nearly equal quality would be made available to students regardless of their geographical location in the state. At the institutional level, such an agency could be helpful through making expert and specialized assistance available.[8]

There is no set pattern for coordination. As noted earlier, much depends on the unique characteristics of the particular state. In fact Wattenbarger and Sakoguchi concluded,

> . . . patterns of governance, as reflected by provisions for a state-level board, do not seem to evolve from a logical and rationally planned solution to the consideration of the changing requirements of the institutions.[9]

Role of Statewide Coordination for Community Colleges

S. V. Martorana delineates three tasks directly related to state boards for community colleges:

> 1. definition of the role of the community junior college board in relation to other state boards responsible for educational affairs in the state;
>
> 2. definition of the role of the board in relation to other state agencies such as those giving support to the executive and legislative branches of government;
>
> 3. clarification of the relationship of the state board and its staff with the administrative boards and staffs of the community colleges in the state.[10]

At this point, it would be profitable to examine Martorana's three tasks in some detail. In terms of relationships with other state boards it would seem, at least theoretically, that divisions of labor and of responsibility should be easily and precisely defined. However, because a large public educational effort cannot be rigidly patterned and because there is necessarily overlapping programs and services at the various educational levels, the several boards with state-level responsibility need to work together

in some harmonious and coordinated way if the total educational effort in the state is to operate effectively.

Looking at Martorana's second task, the board and its staff must look to its relationships with such agencies as the departments of finance or administration, budget, civil service, purchasing, and public works or general services. In order to be effective, the state agency for community colleges must determine the points of contact of operations and policy decision-making that exist, establish policies concerning these relationships, and formulate and establish firm, workable and accepted understandings and ways of working with the staffs of the agencies concerned.

Traditionally, community colleges are locally governed. In attempting to meet the educational and occupational needs of its service community, each institution, typically, paid little attention to the activities of its neighboring institutions. In keeping with this pattern of local autonomy, each institution has traditionally developed its own philosophy, educational programs, and areas of interest. It is obvious that the concept of coordination is not compatible with the traditional philosophy of the locally governed institutions. This, then, is the most critical issue that a state board and its agency staff must face: what is the proper relationship to maintain between

its role and that of the administration of the individual colleges which it oversees?

The critical relationship between the state agency and the individual community colleges is Martorana's third and most delicate task. He suggests the following guiding principles:

> 1. Concentrate on matters of basic policy and broad procedure that are sensitive to and protect the statewide or broad regional interests of the state.
>
> 2. Emphasize its role of supporter, expediter, and general promoter of the individual operating colleges.
>
> 3. Emphasize its function as public interpreter of community college education, its purposes and character.
>
> 4. Stress evaluation and appraisal of the programs and services of the colleges in the state in aspects of their operations.
>
> 5. Exert itself to develop a "sense of system" as well as strong institutional identities in the statewide program of community college education.
>
> 6. Work to bridge gaps by establishing sound bases for articulating and coordinating community college education on the one hand, and baccalaureate and university-level education on the other hand.[11]

During the late Spring and early Summer of 1969, The Southeastern Junior College Leadership Center conducted a nationwide survey to seek a greater understanding of the

composition of state-level staffs and their roles in coordination and/or control of community junior colleges.[12] The fifty states and Puerto Rico were asked to describe their state-level staffs and certain relationships of these staffs to institutions within their system. At that point in time, twenty-seven states reported that their staffs were concerned exclusively or primarily with public community junior colleges.[13] In 1970, Dr. Bob T. Holland conducted a specialized survey of these twenty-seven states.[14]

The purpose of the Holland study was to determine the objectives, administrative organization, and functions of selected state agencies for community colleges in providing services in the area of student personnel administration.

The questionnaire responses revealed the type of administrative services provided and the manner they were given in eighteen areas of student personnel services.

The following general statements summarize this study: The student services functions received relatively little attention from the state staff. Only in the area of financial aids were as many as one-half of the states offering leadership. There was limited involvement at the state level in student activity functions. State agency

staff were showing an increasing interest in the student rights movement.

State agencies were much more interested in the results of the admission and registration activity than in the process itself. Agency staff provided consultant services but usually on a request basis. Guidance and counseling matters were usually decided at the campus level. With regard to the career information function, however, there was considerable assistance given. Numerous joint efforts were undertaken between the state agency for community colleges and the agency for vocational and technical education.

It was in the area of administration of student personnel services that state coordinating agencies were most involved. There was evidence of wide-spread interest in and activities for the program articulation function. In-service education activities were numerous. The most obvious weakness observed was the lack of leadership provided in the area of program evaluation.

As might be expected, whether or not a state agency assigned a staff person specifically to student affairs bore a direct relationship to the amount of services rendered in this area at the state level.

An analysis of the role of the state-level student personnel services function reveals a need for coordination, evaluation and in-service training, statewide management information, statewide manpower or career information and program improvement and development. Furthermore, the advent of a specialized student personnel services responsibility at the state-level may indicate the evolution of a new field of study and preparation that, at the least, should be examined by universities with student personnel administration training programs.

CHAPTER II

THE STUDY

Introduction

This monograph describes a study of state agencies for community/junior colleges in the fifty states and Puerto Rico undertaken during the Spring of 1972. Through the study's nationwide scope, the writer seeks to provide state officials, and others, with a broadened perspective on specialized student personnel responsibilities in state agencies for community/junior colleges.

Purposes

This study has four purposes: (1) to determine if the agency had designated staff with exclusive or primary responsibility for providing administrative services to local student affairs staffs; (2) to determine academic and professional background of state-level student personnel services staff; (3) to determine the nature of the state agency staff's organization; and (4) to develop a useable

directory of personnel at the various agencies to facilitate inter-state communication and cooperation.

Procedures

The procedures for this study included a review of pertinent literature; interviews with Dr. Louis Bender, Co-Director of the Florida State University/University of Florida Center for State and Regional Leadership, and Dr. Bob T. Holland, Coordinator of Student Personnel Services, Division of Community Colleges, State of Florida; the designing of a questionnaire; the administering of the questionnaire to the fifty states and Puerto Rico; and, the presentation of findings.

The investigator structured the questionnaire so as to group questions in three major areas: Staffing, Administrative Organization, and Relationships With Other Agencies. The instrument utilized two responding techniques: "check-off" and "open end." Respondents could indicate by a check whether or not they engaged in a particular activity. In addition, they could indicate, in appropriate questions, the degree or frequency of involvement. The open end space was provided, when appropriate, for the respondent to write-in

expanded comments or alternative answers. These are usually reported verbatim.

Data Collection

The questionnaire was distributed to the chief state officer for community colleges in the fifty states and Puerto Rico. In an attempt to gain a 100% response to the questionnaire, second and third mailings were made to those states that were slow in responding. In addition, a series of telephone calls were made to further increase the return of completed questionnaires. In total, forty-five states and Puerto Rico returned questionnaires. This is a rate of return of 90%. The five states who did not respond to the questionnaire were: Louisiana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont and West Virginia.

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

By the very nature of the questionnaire, additional comments were invited to supplement the "check-off" type of answer. Many respondents added information and sent, along with the completed questionnaire, supporting documents.

Staffing

Twenty-one (46%) of forty-six responding state agencies stated that they had one or more staff members who routinely devoted a percentage of his/her time to the area of student affairs. Table I summarizes this data. Alaska, Florida, Hawaii, Kentucky, Minnesota, North Carolina and Virginia indicated they had at least one staff member who routinely spent 100% of his/her time in the area of student affairs. Virginia had four full-time professionals and Hawaii had three full-time professionals. States indicating 75% involvement are: Hawaii with two professionals, California and Maryland with one each. In the 50% category are: Georgia, Hawaii, Mississippi and Wisconsin again with one each. Illinois had one staff member assigned to one-quarter time responsibility. With responses ranging from 5% to 33% are Colorado, Iowa, Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico and Washington. With reference to the

TABLE I --States with one or more professional staff in the area of student affairs and the percentage of time each devotes to this area

States	100%	75%	50%	25%	Other*
Alaska	1				
California		1			
Colorado					1
Delaware					1
Florida	1				
Georgia			1		
Hawaii	3	2	1		
Illinois				1	
Kentucky	1				
Maryland		1			
Minnesota	1				
Mississippi			1		
Missouri					2
New Jersey					1
North Carolina	1				
Oregon					1
Pennsylvania					1
Puerto Rico					1
Virginia	4				
Washington					1
Wisconsin			1		
TOTAL 21	12	4	4	1	9

*Other = 0 to 24%.

Holland study, it should be noted that his survey included twenty-seven selected states compared with the fifty states and Puerto Rico surveyed in this study. Secondly, Holland requested information on only those personnel routinely devoting 50% or more of their time to student affairs responsibilities.

This researcher was interested in other fields of responsibility for those staff members who were not full-time in the area of student affairs. Assignments were so diverse that no pattern emerged. Table II lists by frequency of response the area of responsibility other than student affairs.

TABLE II -- A listing by frequency of response for areas of responsibility other than student affairs performed by staff personnel in less than full-time student affairs positions

Reason Stated	Number of Mentions
General Administration	3
Personnel	2
Research	2
Accreditation Visits	2
Academic Committees	2
Adult Education	2
Finance	1

TABLE II --Continued

Reason Stated	Number of Mentions
Budget	1
Admissions and Testing	1
Public Information	1
Data Gathering and Reporting	1
Work Shops and Conferences	1
New District Programs	1
State Aid Programs	1
Articulation Conferences	1
Analysis of Legislative Bills	1
Community Service	1
Continuing Education Programs	1
Approval of New Programs	1
Counseling and Guidance K - 12	1
V. A. Approval for Private Vocational Schools	1
Master Planning	1
Accreditation	1
Teacher Certification	1
Other Support Services	1
Policy	1
Information Systems and Data Processing	1
Unuseable Response	1

Table III depicts both the length of time a state agency had had a staff member with student affairs responsibility and the length of time the incumbent held his/her position.

TABLE III --Number of years state agency had had a staff member with student affairs responsibility and number of years incumbent in present position

States with Student Affairs Staff Member	Years Agency Had Position	Years Incumbent in Position
Alaska	8	3
California	3 5/12	3 5/12
Colorado	2	2
Delaware	a	4
Florida	7	2
Georgia	2	2
Hawaii	5	1
Illinois	1	6/12
Iowa	5	5
Kentucky	4	4
Maryland	2	1 1/2
Minnesota	4	4
Mississippi	3	3
Missouri	3/12	1 1/2 & 3 1/2
New Jersey	3/12	6/12

TABLE III --Continued

States with Student Affairs Staff Member	Years Agency Had Position	Years Incumbent in Position
North Carolina	5	3
Oregon	2 5/12	2 5/12
Pennsylvania	7	2
Puerto Rico	1 1/2	c
Tennessee	3	5
Virginia	4	2
Wisconsin	7	3

a. Delaware did not indicate number of years agency had position.

b. Missouri indicated that no specific position had been allocated, personnel listed do not have student affairs as a major responsibility.

c. Puerto Rico's response did not answer specific question. However, the implication of the first answer is that the incumbent has held the position from its inception.

Comparing these two types of information reveals that (1) eighteen of the twenty-one states have had only one student personnel specialist staff member, and (2) in eleven of these cases he was holder of the present position. In Illinois and New Jersey the student affairs staff member had

been employed only three to six months prior to the time of this study. Four of the states had had a staff position with assigned student affairs responsibilities for up to eight years. However, these states, Alaska, Florida, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin have evolved their student personnel positions out of state university or elementary - secondary educational departments. The remaining states had had staff positions from three months to five years.

Respondents were asked to indicate their last previous position, including job title and type of agency, of the present student affairs staff member. Table IV gives these backgrounds.

Eight (25%) of the twenty respondents to this question indicated they had served on the staff of a community college. Two had served as Counselors; the remaining six had held administrative posts. The twelve other respondents came from four-year institutions and state agency responsibilities.

The twenty-five responses to the question on educational background, eighteen (75%) had academic backgrounds in the field of education. Of this number six had degrees in guidance and/or counseling and nine held degrees in some form of educational administration.

TABLE IV --Last previous position held by the present student personnel staff specialist in state agencies for community colleges

Position	Number
Administrative Assistant - Junior College	2
Dean of Students - Junior College	2
Assistant to the Campus Administrator	1
Administrative Assistant to the Commissioner Staff Division for Industrial Development	1
Director of Program Development State College	1
Vocational Guidance Coordinator, Junior College	1
Vocational Counselor	1
Director, Alumni Affairs (Private College)	1
Coordinator Student Services, Junior College	1
Campus Chief Executive (Multi-Campus Community College)	1
Administrator, Title I ES/EA, Department of Public Instruction	1
Assistant Director Placement Services	1
Director of Counseling, Junior College	1

TABLE IV --Continued.

Position	Number
Assistant to Chancellor, Department Higher Education	1
Dean of Evening Division, Junior College	1
Assistant Dean of Students, State College	1
Director of Housing, State University	1
Executive Director for Higher Education - State Agency	1
Associate Director of Athletics	1
Coordinator of Associate Teaching, State University	1
Dean of Students, State College	1

Ten of the twenty-four professionals (41%) held the doctorate, three held advanced masters degrees, ten had a masters degree, and only one had a bachelors degree. Table V also reveals that only two had received degrees in community college administration.

TABLE V --Educational background--highest degree earned and major emphasis of highest degree--of chief student personnel specialists in state agencies for community colleges

State	Degree	Major Emphasis
Alaska	M.A.	Political Science
California	M.A.	Guidance and Counseling
Colorado	Ed.D.	Higher Education, Community College Administration
Delaware	M.Ed.	Counseling
Florida	Ph.D.	Community College Administration/Student Personnel
Georgia	Ph.D.	Measurement
Hawaii	M.A.	Business
Illinois	Ed.D.	Education Administration and Higher Education
Iowa	Specialist in Ed.	Education Administration
Kentucky	M.A.	Guidance and Counseling
Maryland	M.A.(abd)	Higher Education
Minnesota	Ph.D.	Education Administration

TABLE V --Continued.

State		Degree	Major Emphasis
Mississippi		Masters	Physical Ed. and Guidance
Missouri	1	M.Ed.	Education
	2	M.B.A.	Economics
New Jersey		M.A.	Black Studies
North Carolina		Prof. Dipl.	Guidance and Student Personnel
Oregon		Ph.D.	Guidance and Counseling
Pennsylvania		Ed.D.	Education
Puerto Rico		B.S.	Not Listed
Tennessee		M.S.	Finance
Virginia		Ph.D.	Student Personnel Administration
Washington		Ed.D.	Higher Education
Wisconsin		Doctorate	Student Personnel Administration, Higher Education

Survey results point to two important facts. First, that state-level student personnel positions are a relatively new phenomena. None are more than eight years of age, and these evolved from other responsibilities. Full-time positions created directly to serve the state system in student affairs matters have only been extant for five years.

Second, though the majority of respondents held degrees in some field of education, there is wide variation in areas of specialization. It can be inferred from this data that none of the respondents prepared his/herself directly for a state-level position with responsibility for student affairs matters.

Administrative Organization

The next section of the survey questionnaire sought information on the administrative organization of the various state agencies. With regard to the adoption of a statement of purposes for providing administrative/supervisory services in the area of student affairs, only Delaware, Missouri, New Jersey, Virginia, Alabama and Alaska replied in the affirmative. That only six (12%) states would have prepared a specific statement of purpose in this area of responsibility was surprising. It is worthy of note that California and Missouri responded in the affirmative in the Holland survey, but negatively to this survey.

The second question in this section asked for information dealing with the screening and hiring of student personnel professionals at the campus level. The research revealed that only seven (14%) states acknowledged any involvement in the hiring process.

The Delaware respondent indicated that the state

agency actually hired. (There is only one multi-campus public community college in Delaware.) Massachusetts reported that the Board legally appoints but the colleges recruit, screen and recommend. Nevada merely signs contracts on the basis of college recommendation. Kentucky assisted the campuses in a screening process. The agencies of North Carolina, Minnesota and Wisconsin acted as clearing houses for prospective employees by providing information to the colleges.

State agencies were asked to describe any funding formulas which made special provision for providing student personnel services.

Florida, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Virginia and Washington indicated that they had formulas which were designed for this purpose. The remaining forty respondents either did not answer or reported "None" or "No such formula". Portions of these staffing formulas are reproduced in Table VI.

The fourth question in this section asked, "Has provision been made for regular meetings of chief student personnel officers of the community colleges of the state?" Table VII reports the states where this provision is made and the frequency of such meetings. Twenty-two (48%) states

TABLE VI --Formula rates for staffing for student personnel in the colleges of Minnesota, North Carolina and Virginia

Type of Position	Size of Community College			
	600	1200	1800	2200
Minnesota				
Dean of Students	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Counselors	2.00	4.00	6.00	7.33
Financial Aid/Placement	.6	.8	.9	1.00
Activity Director	2.30	3.25	5.00	5.80
Recorder	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
North Carolina				
Administrators	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Counselor or Registrar	2.00	4.00	5.50	7.00
Virginia				
Dean of Student Services	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Coordinator of Counseling Service	0	.50	1.00	1.00
Financial Aid/Placement	0	.50	1.00	1.50
Coordinator of Admissions and Records	.50	1.00	1.00	1.00
Coordinator of Student Activities	0	.50	1.00	1.00

TABLE VII --A listing of the states where provision was made for regular meetings of chief student personnel officers of the community colleges of the state, together with a listing of the frequency of such meetings

State	Frequency of Meetings
California	Once a year
Colorado	Once each six weeks
Connecticut	Quarterly
Delaware	Once a year
Florida	Quarterly
Georgia	Once a year
Hawaii	Once a year (funds permitting)
Illinois	Once a year
Iowa	Monthly
Kansas	Once a year
Kentucky	Once a year
Maryland	Monthly
Minnesota	Three Regions, three times a year
Mississippi	Twice a year
New Jersey	Monthly during academic year
New York	Twice a year
North Carolina	Quarterly
Oregon	Twice a year
Pennsylvania	Three times a year
Virginia	Quarterly
Washington	Quarterly
Wisconsin	Twice a year

answered in the affirmative. Iowa indicated monthly meetings, and New Jersey held meetings each month during the academic year. More than half the respondents indicated such meetings were held either once each year or quarterly.

Each agency was asked to list the reasons why chief student personnel administrators met as a group. Table VIII gives those reasons together with the frequency with which each reason was cited. Whether or not this listing would be the same if deans had responded to the question is a moot point.

TABLE VIII --A listing by frequency of response of the purposes for holding regular meetings of chief student personnel administrators

Reason Stated	Number of Mentions
Exchange of ideas and information sharing	7
Discuss common problems	9
Effect coordination of programs	1
Make policy recommendations and position resolutions	5
Serve as an advisory group to some other body	2
In-service training	3
Planning for new programs	1
Special projects	1
Assistance in developing efficiency in local Student Personnel Divisions	1

The responses can be summarized as follows: periodic meetings on a state-wide basis for the chief student personnel administrators were held to discuss common problems, exchange ideas and information, and make policy recommendations and policy resolutions. To a lesser degree such meetings were advisory to other bodies and had in-service training purposes.

The researcher felt that there was a further dimension to the regular meeting idea for chief student affairs officers. That dimension being a formalization of this group of professionals into some sort of council of student affairs. Question five in this section asked "Is there some type of formally organized state-wide council of student affairs?" Twelve of the responding agencies (26%) provided information about such organizations. Holland's survey did not seek information concerning formally organized councils of student affairs. All but two of these councils were formed since 1967 and, of this number, seven were organized in the last two years. Table IX lists the states with such councils, their dates of formation, sources of authority, and frequency of meetings. Only Illinois did not indicate a date of formation. Memberships of the councils usually were comprised of the chief student personnel administrator from each campus of each community college in the state. Three states,

TABLE IX --States with formally organized state-wide Councils of Student Affairs, date of formation, sources of authority and frequency of meetings

State	Date of Formation	Sources of Authority	Frequency of Meetings
Alabama	1971	Organized under the Auspices of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education	No schedule
Colorado	1971	Agency Staff Decision, President Council Decision	Average every six weeks or two months on various campuses around the state
Connecticut	1972	-----	Two or three times a year
Florida	1969	Agency Staff Decision, President Council Decision (jointly)	Quarterly (various sites)
Hawaii	1970	By President of University System	Periodically depending on business to conduct and funds permitting
Illinois	---	By Community Junior College Association	During meeting of I.J.C.A.A. and at annual Junior College conference
Iowa	1967	By Community Junior College Association	-----

TABLE IX --Continued.

State	Date of Formation	Sources of Authority	Frequency of Meetings
Minnesota	A. 1969	President's Council Decision	A. Fine Arts Instructors and Dean of Students One or two times a year B. Athletic Directors and Dean of Students Two times a year
Mississippi	1970	Regulation of Mississippi Junior College Association	Twice annually in state Department of Education
New York	1962	Agency Staff Decision, President Council Decision	Semi-annually at mutually agreed sites around the state
Virginia	1967	Policy Manual, Agency Staff Decision, Approval of Advisory Committee of Presidents	Quarterly (various sites)
Washington	1960	President's Council Decision	Quarterly

Iowa, Mississippi and Illinois differed from the other nine in that their source of authority was through the state's community junior college association. Though these three had no formal authority to regulate student affairs, they were included because of their apparent coordinative impact on the colleges within the system. Minnesota presented a unique council of student affairs format. By President's Council decision, two statewide councils were formed. One council had as its membership all Fine Arts Instructors and the Dean of Students from each campus, and the other the Athletic Director and Dean of Students from each campus.

Again, as in the question regarding the adoption of a statement of purposes or objectives by the state agency, surprisingly few of the councils for student affairs had such a statement. The statewide councils that did have such a statement were: Alabama, Hawaii, Illinois, Minnesota, Mississippi and Virginia. In the case of Hawaii, the "Inter-Campus Committee for Student Services" adopted a detailed set of goals and objectives that were to be applied directly to the individual campus student services divisions supported by the statewide student services division. Minnesota's two councils had statements of purposes for each of the areas they served. Virginia, Mississippi, and Alabama wrote statements that included discussion of common problems, advisory

relationships to other bodies, and policy recommending responsibilities. It should be noted that the Mississippi and Illinois councils were more directly related to junior colleges associations than to state agencies. However, it was obvious from the agency respondents that these professional organization styled councils did have coordinative importance.

In an attempt to ascertain the extent to which such councils could effect coordination beyond their own systems, the following question was asked, "Can you describe any specific (formal or informal) relationships between the community colleges student affairs council and any other similar body for universities?" Five states, Alabama, Florida, Hawaii, Montana, and New York responded. Though New York and Montana had no formally organized council, their responses to this question indicated that informal relations with other parts of the educational system were increasing. New York noted that the agency was represented at Community College Faculty Council and President's Council meetings and Montana held quarterly meetings for Registrars and Admissions Officers of both two and four year institutions. Hawaii, with its unified system (community colleges are under the purview of the University of Hawaii), had established relationships within the Inter-Campus Committee for Student

Services. The Alabama Council of Student Personnel Educators has membership from both two and four year colleges. The most "accurate" answer given, in terms of the question asked, came from the Florida respondent. In this state, a Council of Student Affairs exists in both the Division of Community Colleges and the University System. Both Councils frequently send representatives to each others meetings.

Looking at other relationships the next question asked, "Can you describe any (formal or informal) relationships between the community college student affairs council and four-year colleges, vocational-technical education or for other agencies?" In this context, only New York and Mississippi indicated any involvement. New York maintains "close liaison" with the two-year agricultural and technical colleges in the state. These colleges are considered distinct from the community college system. More to the point, Mississippi shared information with four year colleges and vocational-technical institutions through its Deans of Student Personnel Association.

The concluding question in this section asked, "If you have no formal body such as a council of Student Affairs to coordinate student services and student personnel programs for community colleges, in what ways is such coordination achieved in your state?" Twenty respondents (43%),

described a variety of activities through which coordination is achieved. Seven states, Alaska, Idaho, Kentucky, Montana, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee pointed to ad hoc informal contacts between campuses. Another six states, Alabama, California, Iowa, Missouri, North Carolina, and Washington wrote of similar ad hoc contacts with the state agency office. Delaware, Illinois, and Wyoming specifically cited ad hoc coordinative efforts through either Administrative or President's Councils. A fourth type of response related to ad hoc relationships with a wide range of professional associations. States in this group included California, Iowa, North Carolina, and Utah. The investigator is of the opinion that a listing of those states that indicated coordinative relationships with professional associations and statewide organizations and committees would be worthwhile:

Alabama	coordination through a state-level Educational Consultant assigned to student affairs on a part-time basis
California	through Office of the Chancellor; California Junior College Association, Committee on Student Personnel; California Community College Counselors' Association; California Community College Placement Officers' Association; California Community College Financial Aid Officers' Association
Iowa	Area Schools and Career Education Branch, Guidance Services Section;

	Iowa Association of Community Colleges; Vocational-Technical Institutes; Students Services Directors' Association
Kentucky	Community College System Senate Committee on Student Services
Missouri	Joint Committee on Transfer Articulation; Missouri College Testing Program; Missouri School and College Relations Committee
North Carolina	Student Services Personnel Association
Utah	Annual Utah Conference on Higher Education ---- involves all two year, four year, public, and private institutions

In concluding this section, the responses of two states bear quotation:

> "very little coordination at this time, except through an annual meeting of colleges at which time a sectional meeting is held for officials in student affairs. A new system beginning July 1, 1973 should provide coordination." (Italics added)
>
> Nebraska

> "community college system is just starting, all coordination is done through Executive Vice-President of each college. Much work is left to be done!"
>
> Nevada

These quotes indicate that the earlier noted trend toward statewide coordination is continuing. (Note: In a letter dated November 6, 1972, the Alabama respondent indicated the

establishment of a position with primary responsibility for student affairs effective January 1, 1973.) Within the next few years at least three more states will have established agency responsibility in coordinating student affairs matters.

Relationships With Other Agencies

The initial item in this final section of the questionnaire asked, "What other state agencies provide administrative services to the college student affairs administrators and what type of services were afforded?"

Eighteen of the forty-six respondents (39%), indicated that other state agencies gave assistance of one kind or another in the field of student affairs. The three agencies most frequently mentioned were the vocational-technical division, the guidance section of the state department of education, and the state commission on higher education. Vocational divisions were cited for (1) Career Education Workshops, (2) publishing career guidance materials, and (3) carrying out statewide and regional manpower studies. The guidance or pupil personnel sections were cited (1) for their publication efforts that benefited community colleges, (2) for their guidance and testing programs, (3) for their policy recommendations with regard to the counseling function,

and (4) for their articulation efforts with high school counselors. The Kentucky respondent noted that the University of Kentucky provided certain services to the community colleges, i.e., financial aid, placement, test advisement, etc.

From Oregon and Pennsylvania came responses that the State Scholarship Commission and the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency worked actively with the colleges in determining who should receive financial aid. Similarly, the Nebraska respondent wrote that the University of Nebraska provided assistance in the form of consultations and workshops. Colorado, Maryland, Missouri, and Virginia mentioned assistance in budgetary coordination, development of reports, data gathering, and advisory participation in, and concern for, articulation. These types of assistance were provided by state councils on higher education in those states. Illinois reported that the Administrator's Division of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges carried out research for the Illinois Junior College Board.

A third question in this section asked, "Please describe your agency's relationship to each of the agencies listed above." Uniformly, the respondents used adjectives such as cooperative, effective, "close ties," and mutually supportive.

Fourteen states (30%) responded to the question that sought information concerning the types of assistance that might be sought by professional associations, on a regular basis, from the state agency. Typical responses included state personnel and guidance associations, placement councils, college personnel associations, financial aid organizations, and state community junior college associations. The types of assistance requested were, information, consultation on policy formulation, assistance and membership on association committees, and planning for conference programs and workshops.

The final question of the survey sought to identify whether formal, informal, or other kinds of relationships were in existence between the state agency and four-year colleges and universities. Seventy-two percent (72%) of the respondents checked one or more of the options available. Twelve states (26%) indicated only informal relationships. Seven states (15%) maintained exclusively formal relationships. Another twelve states (26%) reported combinations of all three possible choices.

Formal relationships were regarded by the respondents as articulation agreements, consortium agreements, joint research projects, and institutional relations in states where community colleges are part of the state university system.

Informal relationships were regarded as those that occur on an ad hoc problem-solving or information sharing basis. In the "Other" category were relationships with a higher education facilities commission and agency staff involvement as instructors in teaching a course for community college student affairs staff on the campus of a state university.

CHAPTER III

SURVEY RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to gether and analyse data from all fifty states and Puerto Rico in the area of statewide coordination of student affairs. The study examined the Staffing, Administrative Organization, and Relationships With Other Agencies of forty-six responding state agencies.

A review of the literature revealed many sources in the field of state-level coordination of higher education, and in the field of student personnel administration. The literature search failed to produce even one source that treated statewide coordination of student personnel services. Only Holland's unpublished doctoral dissertation provided a literature benchmark.

Summary of Findings

Twenty-two (47%) of the forty-six responding state agencies reported they had one or more staff members who

routinely devoted a percentage of his/her time to the area of student affairs. These twenty-one agencies had a total of thirty people in this capacity. Hawaii listed six student affairs staff members, Virginia four, Missouri two, and each of the other nineteen listed one.

Since the Holland study concerned itself only with agencies having personnel who devoted 50% or more of their time to student affairs matters, that study revealed only thirteen staff members with this type of responsibility. This present study revealed that in the two years since Holland conducted his research, Virginia had expanded its staff from three to four full-time professionals, Hawaii had added two staff members who devote 75% of their time to this area.

On the basis of fewer "No" and "Not Applicable" responses, the investigator can infer that states with a staff member assigned to student affairs responsibilities provided significantly more activity than agencies without such a staff position.

Eight agencies--Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Missouri, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and Washington--indicated that, although no member of the agency staff gave as much as half-time to student matters, one certain staff mem-

ber routinely handled student related problems. These agencies are those that did not appear in the Holland study. They employ a total of eight personnel, twenty-eight percent of the survey total of thirty-one staff members who routinely devote a percentage of their time to student affairs matters.

Twelve of the agencies with a student affairs specialist had had only one person filling that role in the history of the agency, and that same person held the position at the time of this study. Only three states--Alaska, Florida, and Pennsylvania--indicated they had had such a position over five years. Twenty-five percent of the student affairs staff members came to their present position having served on the staff of a community college.

In addition to expanding the range of Holland's research from twenty-seven states to the fifty states and Puerto Rico, this investigator expanded the scope of inquiry to ascertain the existence of semi-formal and formal activities that involve all of the chief student affairs officers of the colleges in the individual state community college systems.

Survey results show that twenty-two agencies had made provision for regular meetings of the chief student affairs officers of the colleges. More significant is the fact that

eleven states have established formalized Councils of Student Affairs. Nine of these had been formed since 1967 and seven of this number were organized in the past two years.

Comments from respondents indicate that these meetings are held to exchange information and ideas, make recommendations, and to a lesser degree provide opportunities for in-service training. There was no marked difference in the purposes of the meetings between the Councils of Student Affairs and the less formal groups. Additionally, those states with Councils of Student Affairs frequently commented that the existence of the Council seemed to strengthen institutional relationships with the state agency.

With regard to relationships with other state agencies, the student affairs staff member seems to relate most frequently to the Vocational-Technical Education Division, Pupil Personnel or Guidance Division and the State Financial Aid Agency. The matter of articulation between the various levels of post-secondary education is of pervasive interest; as is the provision of consultative assistance with regard to educational testing practices. There was evidence of considerable activity in the area of developing career education information between the community college state agency staff and staff from the vocational-technical education agency.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the data which have been presented, the following conclusions and recommendations concerning state-level coordination and administration in the area of student affairs have been made.

1. The findings clearly show that the twenty-one states which had staff members with student affairs responsibilities were more actively involved with administrative and coordinative activities affecting the colleges in the state. State agencies for community colleges which do not have a student affairs specialist on their staff should consider the addition of such a person.

2. The Council of Student Affairs, a new organization (nine of eleven formed since 1967), seems to strengthen agency coordinative/administrative efforts. State directors for community colleges in states without such a formal body should explore its viability in their states.

3. The Holland study revealed that thirteen of the twenty-six responding agencies had at least one member of

their staff assigned half-time or more in the area of student affairs. This investigator surveyed the fifty states and Puerto Rico in an effort to assess growth for what appears to be an evolving career field. This survey revealed that of the forty-six responding agencies, twenty-one had one or more professional staff who routinely spend a percentage of their time in the area of student affairs. The range of time devoted to student affairs matters extended from five to one hundred percent. The twenty-one responding agencies employed thirty professionals in this area.

This survey broadened the perspective developed by Holland and points to the fact that as statewide coordination for community colleges continues to expand, state-level student personnel positions become an integral part of the coordinative staff.

4. The most frequent activity involving state-level student affairs staff and their relationships to the colleges and other agencies was consultation. The consulting role requires a broad background of educational leadership.

5. The educational backgrounds of the staff members were quite similar. Seventy-three percent of the respondents held degrees in education. Seven states: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Minnesota, Oregon, and Pennsylvania had

employed staff members with a doctoral degree for the agency's student affairs position. The findings relative to educational background and degrees held indicate that the recruitment of new or additional personnel should have as a primary requirement a broad training program at the doctoral level.

It is this investigator's recommendation that consideration be given to the development of a doctoral program that will specifically prepare graduates for state agency positions with primary responsibility for statewide coordination of student personnel services in community colleges. Such a program would seek to give the student a core of specialized training dealing with the field of student personnel services, the community college, and statewide coordination.

During Fall, 1972, this investigator sent a letter to the respondents to the survey questionnaire. The letter posed a single question: "As I consider the nature of my state-level responsibilities in working with the two-year colleges in student affairs as well as other agencies in the state, what courses of study or what training experience components could a university provide which would better prepare an individual for this type of work?"

Fifteen of the twenty-one states with student affairs (71%) provided responses. The following is a compilation of the understandings and competencies respondents felt a graduate level training program might provide an individual aspiring to a state-level student affairs position:

The state-level student affairs staff member should possess the following competencies:

--A thorough understanding of the historical background, philosophy, current issues and problems, and future directions of community colleges.

--A strong background in the development of higher education in America.

--An understanding of the sociology of students as a social group.

--An understanding of the sociological and management organization of the various components of state government, e.g., agencies, bureaus, divisions, departments, branches.

--An understanding of the sociological and management organization of the various components of the community college, e.g., departments, schools, divisions, etc.

--A thorough understanding of the various forms of statewide coordination of community colleges and impact of the federal government on state systems.

--An understanding of the various types and processes of statewide planning for community college systems.

--The ability to utilize research methodology to conduct appropriate system-wide studies.

--The capability of evaluating such studies through the use of appropriate statistical techniques.

--An understanding of the capabilities of data pro-

cessing systems and their utility to the development of appropriate management information for each institution and the entire community college system.

--An understanding of role of student personnel administration in the community college.

--An understanding of the legal framework of higher education with a special emphasis on the legal aspects of student personnel administration.

--The ability to coordinate the efforts of the agency for community colleges with the agencies for vocational-technical education, the pupil personnel division of secondary education, and financial aid.

--The ability to establish, carry out, and maintain significant in-service training programs for campus practitioners.

--The ability to provide consultive services to the individual colleges.

--The ability to evaluate institutional student affairs programs.

--The capability of initiating system-wide cooperative efforts toward effective articulation of programs between the various levels of post-secondary education.

--The ability to utilize the special expertise of individual campus professionals to improve system-wide practices.

In addition to the above competencies and understandings, the most consistent recommendation received was for significant internships of variable length - up to one year at both the state agency and individual community college level. Given the doctoral level of the program, prior professional experience of at least two years in student personnel, the community college, or a state agency should be a prerequisite for admission to the program.

NOTES

[1]B. L. Morton, "Perspective From a State Coordinator of Higher Education," Educational Record, LI (Summer, 1970), p. 296.

[2]President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Second Report to the President, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957), in T. R. McConnell, A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 143.

[3]The Capitol and the Campus, (New York, New York: The Carnegie Commission On Higher Education, April, 1971), p. 16.

[4]S. V. Martorana, "Developments in State-Level Governance," Junior College Journal Volume 39, December, 1969, p. 25.

[5]James L. Wattenbarger and Melvyn Sakoguchi, State Level Boards for Community Junior Colleges: Patterns of Control and Coordination (Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, August, 1971), p. 37.

[6]Martorana, "State-Level Governance," p. 25.

[7]Lyman A. Glenny, "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," Campus and Capitol, W. John Minter (Ed.) (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966), p. 27.

[8]Lyman A. Glenny, Autonomy of Public Colleges. (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1959), pp. 201-205.

[9]R. C. Richardson, Jr., C. E. Blocker, L. W. Bender, Governance for the Two-Year College (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 26.

[10]Martorana, "State-Level Governance," p. 26.

[11]Ibid. pp. 28-29.

[12]James L. Wattenbarger, William A. Gager, Jr., Jeffrey A. Stuckman and Melvyn Sakoguchi, State Level Staffs for Coordination and/or Control of Community Junior Colleges (Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1970).

[13]Ibid. p. 16.

[14]Bob T. Holland, The Role of State Agencies for Community Colleges in Providing Administrative Services in the Area of Student Personnel Administration (Tallahassee: The Florida State University, 1971) (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 26 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION